



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,476	06/01/2006	Rita Paradiso	0002934USU/3061	3889
27623	7590	08/07/2009	EXAMINER	
OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP			COHEN, LEE S	
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
STAMFORD, CT 06901			3739	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/581,476	Applicant(s) PARADISO, RITA
	Examiner Lee S. Cohen	Art Unit 3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 19-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 19-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0/1/06	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 19-33 are rejected as being incomplete and indefinite for failing to clearly set forth the structure of the fabric. The fabric should be defined as comprising the various elements with positive structural connections between the elements. Wherein is an improper transitional phrase. Claim 21 – the term “so-called” is vague. Claim 26 improperly employs the use of a trademark (i.e., LYCRA). Claims 30 and 31 improperly reference the drawings to define the structure. Claim 32 sets forth only intended use. Claim 33 – “the sleeves” lacks antecedent basis. Claims 34-39 provide for the use and production of the knitted fabric but, since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. Claim 38 – the term “so-called” is vague.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-25 and 27-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradiso et al (Knitted Bioclothes...) in view of Bekaert et al (WO 01/02052). The basic device and methods for using and making are disclosed by Paradiso et al at page 3720 and Figure 1. The reference fails to disclose the details of the multiple layer structure, particular materials, and processes for making. Bekaert et al disclose a similar knitted fabric for monitoring detailing such specifics at column 2, line 26 - column 9, line 3 and column 10, line 5 - column 14, line 32. Given the teachings of Bekaert et al, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to form the knitted fabric of Paradiso et al with the various structures as disclosed by Bekaert et al since a predictable result would ensue.

Claims 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradiso et al (Knitted Bioclothes...) in view of Bekaert et al (WO 01/02052) as detailed supra, and further in view of Wijesiriwardana et al (Resitive Fibre-Meshed Transducers). The combination fails to disclose the use of carbon loaded fibers. Wijesiriwardana et al disclose a similar knitted fabric for monitoring including such fibers. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to form the knitted fabric of Paradiso et al and Bekaert et al with such fibers since a predictable result would ensue.

Double Patenting

Claims 35 and 36 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 34. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP

§ 706.03(k). The actual claimed using steps in these claims are identical rendering them as duplicates.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee S. Cohen whose telephone number is 571-272-4763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Lee S. Cohen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739

/Lee S. Cohen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739
June 29, 2009